The Dual Nature of Lithuanian reflexive -si-: the DM approach

Introduction: The Lithuanian reflexive clitic -si- appears as a suffix in unprefixed verbs (1a) and as a prefix in prefixed verbs (1b). By exploring -si-, this study shows that the preverbal and postverbal placement of a clitic requires two different initial linear positions and the implication that Local Dislocation (LD) can manipulate the output of syntax at PF (Embick&Noyer 2001(E&N)).

(1a) slep-iau-si “I was hiding myself” b. pa-si-slep-iau “I have hidden myself”
hide-PST.1.SG-RFL PRF-RFL-hide-PST.1.SG

Background: -si- is argued to show second position effects (Nevis&Joseph 1993; E&N) because in prefixed verbs with one aspectual prefix (1b), a negation prefix (2) or what has been described as two perfective prefixes su- and pa- in (3) -si- seems to be adjacent to the leftmost prefix. According to E&N, the sub-word -si-, a part of a full morphological word (M-word), is linearized as the leftmost element to the M-word and then it undergoes LD with the adjacent sub-word, a prefix (4a) or a V+T complex (4b).

(2) ne-si- slep-iau “I knew someone” (3) su-si-pažin-au “I have become acquainted with smb”
NOT-RFL-hide-PST.1.SG PRF-RFL-PA-know-PST.1SG

(4) a. [-si- [ Prefix-Prefix-V-T ] ]→ [ Prefix -si- Prefix-V-T] b. [-si- [V-T]]→[[V-T]-si-]

Claims: In prefixed verbs, -si- is not a second position clitic (contra E&N). We distinguish between the aspectual prefix pa- in (1b) and pseudo-prefix pa- (3) showing that unlike perfective prefix, pseudo-prefix has a non-transparent meaning and is a part of the root. New data from prefix stacking and the distinction between perfective and pseudo-prefixes show that -si- is always attached to the root ruling out the analysis in (4a). We give evidence that like German sich (Schäfer 2008) and Icelandic -st- (Wood 2015), the Lithuanian reflexive is a valency-reducing morpheme which starts off in VoiceP and projects higher than the aspectual prefix pa-(1b) in vP (Svenonius 2004). To capture the mismatch between the syntactic output and the linear representation, we suggest that LD manipulates only certain sub-words, only the perfective prefixes, and not pseudo-prefixes, showing that LD at sub-word level is restricted.

Prefix-stacking: (5) gives a template of the order of Lithuanian prefixes. Te- and be- are so-called super-lexical prefixes (Svenonius 2004) where the former has a permissive meaning and the latter has a progressive meaning presenting Outer Aspect. When super-lexical prefixes are present, -si- attaches to the host (6a). Aspectual perfective prefixes pa-su- present Inner Aspect, merge lower than be- and always precede -si- standing next to the root (6b).

(5) [ TP te- [ NegP ne- [ AspP be- [ vP ...Aspectual Perfective Prefix + root...]]]]
(6) a. te-ne-be-si-slėpia “don’t let him hide himself” b. ne-be-pa-si-slėpia
“don’t let him hide himself” “he/she is not able to hide himself/herself”

Aspectual versus Pseudo-Prefixes: -si- never occurs between two prefixes even in (3). pa- in (7a) is a pseudo-prefix, it forms a non-transparent meaning with a root, while pa- in (7b) is a perfective prefix which has a transparent meaning. Pseudo-prefixes behave like parts of roots: a. they cannot be separated from their host (7a), unlike aspectual prefixes (7b); b. -si- cannot intervene between the pseudo-prefix and the root (8a), unlike with aspectual prefixes (8b); c. pseudo-prefixes combine with aspectual prefixes (9a), while aspectual prefixes cannot be reiterated (9b). We follow Arad (2003) assuming that the root is assigned an interpretation once
it is merged with a verbalizer. To capture the idiosyncratic meaning, the pseudo-prefix and the root are merged first, and then this complex merges with the verbalizer. The perfective prefix is merged with the verbalized root as illustrated in (11).

(7) a. *(pa)-žin-ti become acquainted (with) PA-know-INF b. (pa)-slėp-ti “to have hidden PRF-hide-INF
(8) a. pa-*(si)-žin-au-si Pa-RFL-know-PST.1.SG-RFL b. pa-si-slėp-au-*(si) PRF-RFL-hide-RFL
(9) a. su-si-pa- žin-ti “become acquainted (with) ” b. *su-pa-si-slėp-ti “to have hidden by oneself” PRF-RFL-PA-know-INF PRF-PRF-RFL-hide-INF

Location and Syntax of -si-: -si- is in VoiceP lower than Outer AspP, but higher than a vP hosting Inner Aspect prefixes. -si- causes the loss of one of the arguments as in anticausatives (10a). Anticausatives lack an implicit external argument, but like passives (10b) have a nominative theme argument. Following (Schäfer 2008, Wood 2015), we claim that anticausatives have an empty expletive Voice head with -si- specifier which is not interpreted thematically.

Doors.NOM PRF-REFL-open.PST Jonas.GEN Door.NOM.SG was opened Jonas.GEN “The door has opened itself *(by Jonas).” “The door was opened by Jonas. ”

Unprefixed verbs: E&N’s analysis cannot account for -si- realized as a suffix for cases like (12-13). While [V+T] complex may be realized as one sub-word, suffixes like verbalizers (12) or causatives (13) can intervene between V and T making it a complex M-word. E&N’s theory would predict that being a second position clitic -si- would occur between a V and morpheme adjacent to it (13) which does not match with linear representation (cf. 12b).

(12) a. kiln-o-jo-si “he was lifting himself” lift-v-PST.3-RFL b. aug-in-a-si “he is growing smth by himself” grow-CAUSE-PST.3-RFL
(13) *[-si- [V+CAUSE+T] ⇒ [V+si+CAUSE+T]}

Reanalysis: We develop a two-step analysis with two initial linear positions for -si-. If the host has no prefix, -si- is linearized as a suffix after T. If the host has a prefix, -si- is linearized as a prefix. This type of clitic placement is also attested in European Protuguese where the syntactic output determines whether the clitic appears as proclitic or enclitic (Barbosa 2008). Once -si- is linearized as a prefix, it undergoes LD with the perfective prefix and becomes adjacent to the root. LD then selects only for aspecutal prefixes and never for pseudo-prefixes combined with roots or single roots since in those cases -si- never changes its position.

Conclusion: This study shows that to account for a two place clitic we need the implication for two initial positions. We give additional evidence for the implementation of LD and show that LD at sub-word level is rather restricted. The distinction between Outer and Inner Aspect prefixes is drawn which corresponds to external and internal projection in a verb phrase (Travis 2010). Lastly, this study contributes to the syntax of reflexives showing that they reduce the argument strucure of a verb and could be consider to be a type of VoiceP.